DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 781 HE 030 582

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Statewide Program Evaluation: A Reexamination. |
| INSTITUTION | Illinois State Board of Higher Education, Springfield. |
| PUB DATE | 1997-09-03 |
| NOTE | 24p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Illinois Board of Higher Education, 500 Reisch Bldg., 4 West Old Capitol Square, Springfield, IL 62701. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative (142) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *College Instruction; *College Programs; Educational Policy; *Higher Education; Input Output Analysis; *Outcomes of Education; *Program Evaluation; Public Colleges; *State Boards of Education; State Programs |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Illinois State Board of Higher Education |

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the purposes and criteria of statewide program evaluations in higher education, focusing on the development of program evaluations in Illinois, and presents new statewide criteria for program approval and review. It also discusses the role of the Illinois State Board of Higher Education in approving and reviewing programs at state institutions. The paper reviews the changing nature of academic programs at colleges and universities and changing approaches to evaluating such programs. During the 1970s many states, including Illinois, selected program evaluation guidelines that focused on productivity, cost, quality, and need criteria. In recent years program evaluation efforts have become more cognizant of student outcomes and preferred academic practices criteria. New guidelines that focus on curriculum, faculty, students, and support services, are recommended to strengthen the program review and approval processes. Copies of the guidelines are appended. (Contains 15 references.) (MDM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 414 781

Item #6B
September 3, 1997

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

# STATEWIDE PROGRAM EVALUATION: A REEXAMINATION

HE030 582

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Illinois Board of Higher Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item #6B
September 3, 1997

STATE OF ILLINOIS
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

# STATEWIDE PROGRAM EVALUATION: A REEXAMINATION

## Background

This paper examines the purposes and criteria of statewide program evaluation. It is an outgrowth of previous Board studies that suggested staff undertake a review of program evaluation criteria pertaining to faculty roles and responsibilities and graduate education programs. Analysis was broadened when it became apparent that a fundamental issue to both topics was how to improve program evaluation to benefit students and enhance student learning. The paper proposes new statewide criteria for program approval and program review, presented in the appendices.

Approval and review of academic programs constitute one of the Board of Higher Education's major areas of responsibility. The *Illinois Compiled Statutes*, Chapter 110, Section 205.7, require public universities and community colleges through the Illinois Community College Board to receive Board of Higher Education approval before establishing "any new unit of instruction, research or public service." The statutes also authorize the Board to undertake periodic reviews of these programs and "to advise the appropriate board of control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified."

Through the exercise of its program authority, the Board attempts to maximize resource and program effectiveness. The Board's program processes constitute one of the basic building blocks of statewide and institutional planning which are linked to the setting of priorities, the allocation of resources and budget development, and P•Q•P actions. Statewide program approval and review processes are also accountability measures that demonstrate to the citizens of the state the efforts that are being taken to address educational needs and maintain programs of high quality.

The principal elements of Illinois' program approval and review processes were put in place during the 1970s. The fourth *Master Plan for Postsecondary Education in Illinois*, adopted in February 1976, offered the first detailed proposal for implementing a statewide academic program approval and review process, which was later amplified and amended through administrative rules and guidelines under the Resource Allocation Management Program (RAMP).

The Board's initiative came at a time when many other states were adopting similar mechanisms. Creating statewide program approval and review mechanisms represented a targeted response to meeting new academic needs, following a decade-long era that relied on strategies of major capital expansion to accommodate a rising tide of students. The new processes sought to adjust rather than expand capacity. Selective growth and reallocation were to occur on a case by case basis following careful program review. Concerns also existed that rapid enrollment growth had diluted standards, threatening program quality and requiring corrective action. For example, a study by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education in the mid-1970s called for institutions to undertake a more active and critical review of their academic programs and noted that only three percent of surveyed schools had engaged in "extensive" graduate program elimination or consolidation.


BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Under current guidelines, institutions assume primary responsibility for program development and review under a framework and general criteria established by the Board. Institutions must address nine criteria when seeking approval of an academic program. They must show that there is student demand and occupational need and that the proposed program does not duplicate unnecessarily similar programs offered at other Illinois colleges and universities. They must also demonstrate that the proposed program relates to the institution's mission and program priorities, and how the program will be structured, staffed, and supported to ensure a quality education.

Existing criteria for program review are similar to program approval criteria and require institutions to evaluate factors such as student demand, occupational demand, centrality to instructional mission, program breadth, success of graduates, costs, quality, and productivity. Perhaps the most important of these criteria concern program quality. The Board requires institutions to address quality issues such as "is the program achieving its objectives; are faculty qualified and productive; are high standards for students maintained; and do students achieve their academic and career objectives?"

Public universities and community colleges report annually to the Board of Higher Education on the results of their program reviews. Public university reviews are coordinated on an eight-year cycle by discipline, so that each year the Board receives a comprehensive assessment of programs in designated subject areas. Community college programs are reviewed on a coordinated five-year schedule. Immediately prior to the start of these institutional evaluations, BHE and ICCB staffs prepare program analyses that present relevant program information about enrollment, degrees awarded, staffing, and costs, and identifies statewide issues that programs should address. The Community College Board also collects follow-up information on students completing occupational programs for use in review of these programs.

## The Changing Nature of Academic Programs

The challenge of reviewing and approving academic programs according to a small set of statewide criteria is a daunting one, given the vast array of academic programs and practices that exist in the state. Another complicating factor is that programs evolve with economic and social conditions, a particular problem in recent decades which have experienced exponential growth not only in the number but in the type of academic programs. For instance, the 1997 edition of *Peterson's Guide to Graduate and Professional Programs* lists 986 master's degree titles, or 557 percent more than the 150 different titles that existed in 1960. Other academic levels have also demonstrated strong growth. For instance, the National Research Council's classification system lists 290 fields of doctoral study, or 92 percent more than the 151 fields that existed in 1962.

Structural changes in post-modern economies, including the rise and stratification of knowledge-based industries such as bio-technology, health care, and communications, have fueled the expansion of academic programs. Developments in technology such as medical imaging have created new professions with their own training and educational needs. Fields such as computer science have become increasingly complex, splintering into diverse subspecialties in a now familiar process by which discrete areas of inquiry become subspecialties and, later possibly, separate fields of study. For example, computer science now encompasses specialties such as software, hardware, theory, artificial intelligence, data bases, information systems, and graphics. These same forces have spurred a dramatic growth in interdisciplinary programs as specialties have come

together outside normal disciplinary boundaries to offer degrees in fields as disparate as cognitive science, women's studies, gerontology, environmental science, and health administration.

The evolutionary change in the nature of academic programs has been most notable perhaps in master's education. As Judith Glazer has noted, a master's degree no longer represents an intermediate stage in an academic progression from the baccalaureate to the doctorate but has been transformed into a professional degree with different educational purposes, structures, and practices. In the past two decades, she argues a paradigm shift in master's education has occurred. This new paradigm is:

> "practitioner oriented, emphasizing training in skills, career development, and pragmatic goals. It is linked to the needs of the student and the demands of the market place and driven by externally imposed standards, and it emphasizes practice rather than theory, skills rather than research, training rather than scholarship.... The master's degree is overwhelmingly professional, it is largely terminal, and it is practice oriented."[1]

Changes in master's education have affected content and pedagogy. Even traditional liberal arts fields such as anthropology, history, and sociology have developed applied programs. English now offers not only programs in traditional areas such as literature and linguistics but in occupationally oriented specialties such as technical writing and composition. These new applied programs often involve experiential learning such as externships that seek to prepare students for the workforce. Although many require a culminating educational experience and a final product that demonstrates student learning, fewer now require a thesis. Julius LaPidus, President of the Council of Graduate Schools, has estimated that about 70 percent of the students earning master's degrees in the United States do not write a thesis.

An excellent study that describes the change that has occurred in master's education is *A Silent Success: Master's Education in the United States*. Based on interviews of 800 individuals in 11 different disciplines, this 1993 monograph presents a master's taxonomy that is far different from the standard bifurcated treatments rooted in academic versus non-academic distinctions. Instead, the authors divide master's programs into four types: ancillary, community-centered, career advancement, and apprenticeship programs. Varying purposes, curricular requirements, and interactions between faculty and staff distinguish these program categories. Most have a workforce or professional orientation and depart in significant ways from the common practices of academic disciplines.

### Changing Approaches to Evaluating Academic Programs

As part of establishing statewide program evaluations in the 1970s, states had to formulate criteria to guide the new procedures, a process that was said to produce "considerable anguish for many agencies." To assist in this effort, the Education Commission of the States created a Task Force on Graduate Education that recommended consideration of factors such as 1) enrollment, 2) degrees awarded, 3) class size, 4) cost per degree, 5) faculty workload, 6) faculty qualifications, 7) student demand, 8) statewide enrollment and degrees, 9) appropriateness of the program to an

---

[1] Judith S. Glazer, *The Master's Degree: Tradition, Diversity, Innovation*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, no.6. Washington, D.C.: 1986, cited in Clifton F. Conrad, Jennifer Grant Haworth, Susan Bolyard Millar, *A Silent Success: Master's Education in the United States*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

institution's mission, and 10) program quality as reflected in reputational studies, faculty qualifications, and positions achieved by program graduates. Most states, including Illinois, eventually selected guidelines that centered on productivity, cost, quality, and need criteria. These measures often had the advantage of being quantifiable, permitting evaluation of quality and productivity in terms of "inputs" such as costs, faculty publications and grant awards, or student admission scores. Of course, making decisions on the basis of these indicators remained far from simple as the review often produced mixed results—for instance, revealing a program with high cost but an outstanding reputation.

Initial statewide criteria have proved long-lasting and still constitute the core evaluation standards used in Illinois and most other states. Research has also shown that there are positive relationships between program quality and traditional criteria such as faculty educational training and scholarly productivity, programmatic financial resources, and measures of student selectivity. Nevertheless, the limitations of such criteria have become increasingly apparent. Perhaps their greatest liability is that they offer limited utility for evaluating workforce programs, as opposed to more traditional academic programs. For example, measures such as scholarly background and productivity are less relevant to a program that is preparing graduates for professional practice than they are for a program preparing students for research. Also, traditional criteria do not offer much insight about how to measure or foster student development. Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini, for instance, have concluded:

> "After taking into account the characteristics, abilities, and backgrounds students bring with them to college, we found that how much students grow or change has only inconsistent, and perhaps in a practical sense, trivial relationship with such traditional measures of institutional "quality" as educational expenditures per student, student/faculty ratios, faculty salaries, percentage of faculty with the highest degree in their field, faculty research productivity, size of the library, admissions selectivity, or prestige rankings."[2]

For more than a decade, there has been considerable interest in and discussion about introducing factors related to student outcomes into the assessment of academic programs. Outcomes criteria carry the advantage that they are results oriented and seek to demonstrate how education affects post-graduate success. While some outcomes measures, such as degrees awarded, have historically been a part of statewide criteria, the intention of assessing outcomes has been to extend data collection into areas such as student retention, performance on post-graduate licensing and professional exams, and post-graduate employment and career advancement. In Illinois, changes in the statewide review process during the 1990s produced new criteria on student outcomes. Institutions were asked to assess the "success of graduates" and to address questions about post-graduate employment and educational experience, as well as student and alumni program satisfaction.

The introduction of outcome criteria represents a positive contribution by supplementing a traditional, input-oriented approach with a perspective that pays attention to students and program results. To date, however, there has been more discussion than action on implementing output evaluation in most states. This reluctance is partly due to the time and cost associated with creating output-based data systems. Also, the most common output data often offer limited assistance in

---

[2] Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini, *How College Affects Students*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991, cited in Jennifer Grant Haworth and Clifton F. Conrad, "Refocusing Quality Assessment on Student Learning", in *Assessing Graduate and Professional Education: Current Realities, Future Prospects*, (Haworth, ed.), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

program improvement. For example, while it is important to know if graduates are dissatisfied with a program or have experienced difficulties finding employment, such information does not indicate what action should be taken to right the problems.

As noted, while traditional input and newer output approaches to program evaluation offer valuable perspectives for analyzing and improving program productivity and performance, they offer less satisfactory information about students and student learning. This shortcoming has become more obvious with the growth in knowledge about how student learning occurs, and with the increased interest on campus in finding ways to promote effective teaching and learning. In most cases, the growing literature on student learning only tangentially connects with questions of program evaluation, although recent studies have clear implications for program structure and pedagogy. Research has not found any single instructional technique or practice that will unfailingly boost student performance because learning is situational, varying by discipline and individual. However, research has demonstrated a strong correlation between learning and certain behaviors and practices, such as the amount of student time-on-task, faculty/student contact, student/student contact, and "active learning" pedagogy.

Working within this body of research, various individuals and groups have sought to identify and establish preferred academic practices. One well known effort was the development of the "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education." A monograph edited by Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson and supported by the American Association of Higher Education, the Education Commission of the States, and the Johnson Foundation describes these principles: student-faculty contact, cooperation among students, active learning, prompt feedback, time on task, high expectations, and diverse ways of learning. The monograph emphasizes the role that higher educational administrators can play in fostering an environment that nurtures these practices. In particular, it recommends that states influence the development of such practices through allocation of financial support and "by encouraging sound planning, setting priorities, mandating standards, and *reviewing and approving programs*" (emphasis added).

Similarly, at the graduate level, a major study by William Bowen and Neil Rudenstine has shown that doctoral students in departments with certain norms and structures have greater student success and improved time to degree. The authors recommend changing the ways in which students prepare for and proceed with their dissertations. They advocate that there should be a "greater sense of collegiality" in research and writing the dissertation and that departments should look for procedures and mechanisms that help students choose realistic dissertation topics and "maintain momentum" at the dissertation stage. At least one discipline, mathematics, has undertaken a number of studies—such as *Crossroads in Mathematics* by the Task Force on Standards for the Introductory College Mathematics Project—to ascertain how disciplinary content and pedagogy can enhance student academic performance. Interestingly, this study advocated both general pedagogical practices—such as promoting active student involvement and use of multiple teaching strategies—and discipline-specific teaching techniques—such as the use of open-ended problems as opposed to problems with only one possible answer.

One example of an attempt to support and improve student learning through structuring of the program evaluation process is the work of Clifton Conrad and Jennifer Grant Haworth, whose classification of master's programs was described above. In *Silent Success*, they identify quality characteristics that can be found in all types of master's programs. Quality programs, they emphasize, have a strong unity of purpose that is communicated to students through a supportive and challenging learning environment. They also have strong leadership and receive departmental and



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

institutional support. The curriculum has a core body of coursework which culminates in the production of a tangible product. Program structure encourages immersion in the subject, and teaching promotes active learning and frequent contact between professors and students, as well as among students.

Haworth and Conrad expand on these ideas in "Refocusing Quality Assessment on Student Learning." The central theme of this article is that "the most animating force in high quality programs is diverse and engaged participants." "Engaged" programs are described as having five main characteristics: diverse and engaged participants, participatory cultures, interactive teaching and learning, connected program requirements, and adequate resources. The authors stop short of developing criteria for a full program assessment although they do present relevant indicators. They advocate, for instance, that admission "should be based heavily on the 'goodness of fit' between student goals and those of the faculty and program" and should "emphasize a variety of criteria, including educational background, life experience, professional nonuniversity workplace experience, cultural diversity, academic achievement, and motivation for learning."

Haworth and Conrad's work has clear implications for faculty. In their view, faculty affective behavior—that is, the commitment and leadership that faculty bring to instructional efforts—contribute significantly to program success. Faculty in successful programs "dedicate significant time and energy to teaching, including outside-of-class involvement with students" and bring diverse perspectives and experiences to these activities.

In summary, there is a growing body of research that addresses directly or indirectly the relationship between student learning and the structure, content, and pedagogy of academic programs. To date, few of the findings have been formalized into statewide program criteria. It is time that the process of program evaluation benefited by drawing on these findings more directly. Such changes should be additive in nature, supplementing, not supplanting, existing criteria which remain useful if not comprehensive.

**Proposed Changes in Statewide Program Approval and Review Guidelines**

Attachments A and B present revised statewide program approval and review guidelines. Staff intends to circulate these drafts to administrators and faculty at public institutions for comment. After consultation, staff will produce new guidelines available for use in the next cycle of program reviews to be submitted to the Board in July 1999. The changes recommended are supplementary in nature, with most current language retained. The new language is intended to strengthen the review of program processes related to instruction. In drafting the proposed language, staff consulted the above-cited literature, as well as the recommendations on evaluating graduate programs developed by the Illinois Association of Graduate Schools in October 1996.

The main changes in the program review criteria are the addition of four new categories pertaining to curriculum, faculty, students, and staff resources in the section of the RAMP guidelines entitled "Reporting Requirements for Review of Instructional Programs." In the program approval criteria, new language is proposed for the RAMP guidelines pertaining to curriculum, students, faculty, and support services. Proposed new language is in italics. Both program review and approval changes are intended to strengthen evaluation of instruction and student learning. It is recognized that in many cases program development and review at the institutional level already may be addressing such criteria. The proposed changes will provide Board staff with important information pertinent to the exercise of statewide program approval and review authority, as well

as enhanced program accountability. The proposed changes will not modify in any way the decentralized nature of the state's program development and review processes but are intended to offer general priorities and criteria adaptable to the realities of individual institutional and disciplinary settings.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY


Barak, Robert J. and Berdahl, Robert O. *State-Level Academic Program Review in Higher Education*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978.

Bowen, William G. and Rudenstine, Neil L. *In Pursuit of the Ph.D.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Chickering, Arthur and Gamson, Zelda F. (eds) *Applying the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Conrad, Clifton F. and Blackburn, R. "Program Quality in Higher Education: A Review and Critique of Literature and Research." In Smart, J.C. (ed.). *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Volume I). New York, 1985.

Conrad, Clifton F.; Haworth, Jennifer Grant; and Millar, Susan Bolyard. *A Silent Success: Master's Education in the United States*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Council of Graduate Schools. *Master's Education: A Guide for Faculty and Administrators. A Policy Statement*. Washington, DC: 1994.

Haworth, Jennifer Grant. "Doctoral Programs in American Higher Education." In Smart, J.C. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Volume XI). New York, 1996.

Haworth, Jennifer Grant (ed.). *Assessing Graduate and Professional Education: Current Realities, Future Prospects*. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 92. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Illinois Association of Graduate Schools. "Graduate Education Recommendations: An Overview." Unpublished Document. Springfield, IL, 1996.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. *A Master Plan for Postsecondary Education in Illinois*. Springfield, IL: 1976.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. *Statutes and Administrative Rules*. Springfield, IL: 1995.

Jedamus, Paul; Peterson, Marvin W.; and Associates (ed.). *Improving Academic Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

National Center for Education Statistics. *A Preliminary Study of the Feasibility and Utility for National Policy of Instructional "Good Practice" Indicators in Undergraduate Education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Writing Team and Task Force on Standards for Introductory College Mathematics Project. Cohen, Don (ed.). *Crossroads In Mathematics: Standards for Introductory College Mathematics Before Calculus*. Memphis: American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges, 1995.

Zar, Jerrold H. "Master's-Degree Programs: Volume, Variety, Versatility, and Vitality." In *Proceedings of the Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools*. (Pre-publication Copy).

## APPENDIX A

## PROPOSED RAMP GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW*

The results of program reviews provide the basis for internal decisions on productivity improvements, formulation of program development plans, and budget development. The program review process should be guided by campus priorities and informed by statewide analyses.

The primary focus of the review process is the improvement of the quality and productivity of individual academic programs and units of research and public service, and assures that each unit continues to be consistent with the university's priorities. The program review process is the principal mechanism for promoting program effectiveness, improving quality, and contributing to public accountability. As a result of program reviews, actions are taken at the campus level to remedy concerns and problems identified including curricular revisions, resource adjustments, program restructuring, and program elimination. The primary responsibility for initiating and conducting program reviews rests with the universities.

The Board of Higher Education has statutory responsibility to "review periodically all existing programs of instruction, research and public service at state universities and to advise the appropriate board of control if the contribution of each program is not educationally and economically justified." Further, the program review process is an important component of the priorities, quality, and productivity initiative at both the institutional and state levels. From a state perspective, the review of academic units includes the following elements:

- The review schedule provides for the submission of the results of reviews of similar programs by all universities at the same time.
- A statewide analysis, coordinated with the review schedule, defines statewide issues, examines capacity in fields of study across universities, and provides comparative information for institutional reviews of individual programs.
- Universities conduct program reviews according to campus-developed procedures and submit the results of reviews to the Illinois Board of Higher Education.
- The results of program reviews are analyzed by the staff and recommendations on the educational and economic justification of selected programs are included in the staff's annual Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (P·Q·P) report and recommendations.

The following sections describe these elements and provide guidelines and reporting requirements.

### 1. Program Review Schedule

A schedule for submission of the reviews of academic programs is provided in Table 1. Research and public service centers should be reviewed at the same time as related instructional programs. Summaries of reviews of academic programs should be submitted on July 1st.

The program review schedule calls for the submission of program review reports for groups of programs on specified dates. However, institutions may conduct reviews within a reasonable period (e.g., up to three years) prior to the submission date in order to coordinate reviews with accreditation and other evaluations.

**Program Review Schedule**

| | CIP | Discipline Codes | Statewide Analysis Distributed |
|---|---|---|---|
| Submission July 1996 | 13G<br>22<br>25 | Education: Graduate Programs<br>Law & Legal Studies<br>Library Sciences | July 95 |
| | | | |
| Submission July 1997 | 49<br>47<br>15<br>01,02,03<br>19,20<br>30<br>38<br>42<br>24 | Transportation<br>Mechanics & Repairers<br>Engineering Technology<br>Agriculture & Natural Resources<br>Home Economics<br>Multi-Interdisciplinary Studies<br>Philosophy & Religion<br>Psychology<br>Liberal Arts & Sciences, General Studies | July 96 |
| | | | |
| Submission July 1998 | 52<br>08<br>16 | Business<br>Marketing<br>Foreign Languages | July 97 |
| | | | |
| Submission July 1999 | 44<br>43<br>45 | Public Administration & Services<br>Protective Services<br>Social Sciences & History | July 97 |
| | | | |
| Submission July 2000 | 09,10<br>31<br>05<br>50 | Communications & Com Technologies<br>Parks, Recreation, Leisure, & Fitness Studies<br>Area Studies<br>Visual & Performing Arts | July 98 |
| | | | |
| Submission July 2001 | 04<br>14<br>11<br>40 | Architecture & Design<br>Engineering<br>Computer & Info Sciences<br>Physical Sciences | July 99 |
| | | | |
| Submission July 2002 | 51<br>12<br>26 | Health Professions & Related Sciences<br>Personal and Miscellaneous Services<br>Biological Sciences | July 2000 |
| | | | |
| Submission July 2003 | 13UG<br>23<br>27 | Education<br>English Language & Literature/Letters<br>Mathematics | July 2001 |

## 2. Statewide Analysis

Board of Higher Education staff will develop a statewide analysis of trends and identify statewide issues in each program area. This report will be provided to institutions one year prior to the date that university submissions are due. Table 1 also shows the schedule for distribution of the statewide analysis. This analysis will examine enrollment and degrees granted trends, student characteristics, program costs, occupational demand, and other measures appropriate to the disciplines being examined. The primary purpose of this analysis is to provide a statewide context for at least the later stages of the review process as each campus makes decisions about the recommendations resulting from their reviews of individual programs. Universities will be asked to incorporate responses to statewide issues in their program review submissions. The staff analysis may also include recommendations for expansion or reduction of certain types of programs on a statewide (not campus specific) basis.

## 3. Review Guidelines

Program review systematically and thoroughly examines both qualitative and quantitative aspects of an instructional program including *curriculum, students, faculty, support services,* student demand, occupational demand, centrality in relation to instructional mission, program breadth, ~~success of graduates,~~ program costs, and program quality *and productivity*. The review process should provide for broad involvement of faculty from both within and outside the program and department, as well as the involvement of students and academic administrators. The process also should provide for examination of the program at multiple levels within the institution. The process may involve advisory committees and consultants or evaluators external to the institution. *Appropriate data, benchmarked to institutional or statewide reviews, should be used.* Program review is expected to result in specific improvements in the quality and productivity of a program *and provide the opportunity to strengthen and up date even the programs of highest quality.*

## 4. Reporting Requirements for Review of Instructional Programs

Summaries of the results of the reviews of instructional programs should be submitted on July 1st of each year according to the following guidelines:

A brief summary ~~(one or two pages)~~ *(three to four pages)* should be submitted for each program reviewed. These summaries should focus on the conclusions of reviews and on the actions taken to improve the quality and productivity of the program. *Data and benchmarks should be reported to support conclusions as appropriate.* Program reviews should address the following questions, and the key findings and recommendations in each of these areas should be the substance of the summary submitted to the Board of Higher Education.

*Curriculum:*

- *Are course requirements for the degree up to date? Do they ensure general and specialized learning and training appropriate to the field, level of the degree, and the objectives of the program?*
- *To what extent are course and degree requirements structured to afford students diverse opportunities to prepare for future career roles? Are externships and other workforce educational experiences appropriate to the program and of high quality?*

- *How does the curriculum develop academic capabilities such as writing, problem-solving, statistical analysis, and computer/technology skills in a way appropriate to the field, level, and objectives of the program?*
- *Is the curriculum coherent? Are the program's core courses appropriate to program objectives? Are program requirements interconnected so as to support each other? Is an appropriate culminating experience(s) and product(s) required?*

*Students*

- *Are there multiple admissions criteria that seek to admit students from a variety of backgrounds and educational and work experiences? How do criteria recognize student motivation for learning and seek "goodness of fit" between student goals and those of faculty and the program?*
- *To what extent do students invest time and energy in their own and others' learning through active participation in formal and informal learning activities?*
- *How are high standards for academic performance set and maintained? How is student academic performance measured and periodically monitored for progress throughout the program? Are key student intellectual skills and abilities appropriate to the discipline periodically assessed with progress and deficiencies communicated back to students?*
- *Are part-time and full-time students afforded comparable opportunities and subject to the same expectations?*
- *What is the typical time needed to complete the program and how does student time to degree compare with rates of progress at similar programs at the institution and at comparable institutions?*
- *When applicable, how do students or graduates perform on licensure or certification exams or on other standardized tests?*
- Do current students and alumni report satisfaction with the program?
- Do graduates of the program report appropriate rates of job placement and/or success in subsequent education? Do they achieve their academic and career objectives?

*Faculty*

- *Are faculty effectively communicating to students the purposes, content, and practices of the program? Are faculty serving as advisers and mentors to students in ways that are appropriate to the program's objectives, level, and discipline?*
- *To what extent are faculty in the program encouraged and supported to develop techniques and strategies that promote faculty/student and student/student contact and involvement, and enhance student learning?*
- *How are faculty background, training, and scholarship suited to the program? Does faculty scholarship support multiple program goals—for example, research and pedagogy objectives for doctoral programs?*
- *Are measures appropriate to the field, level, and program objectives used to evaluate faculty quality and productivity? Are multiple measures used to evaluate faculty instruction, including student and faculty evaluation?*
- *Does the diversity of faculty background and experience, and the mix of faculty by rank, tenure status, and part-time/full-time status support program goals and objectives?*
- *Do faculty make appropriate use of computer software and instructional technologies?*

*Support Services*

- *Are library holdings, laboratories, equipment, and space adequate and up to date? Are advising and other student support resources appropriate to support a productive and quality program?*
- *Do the program's computer hardware and software systems appropriately meet instructional needs and enhance student learning? Are computer training and support staff available to faculty?*

Student Demand

- Do the credit hours, enrollments, or degree production of this program differ significantly from statewide or institutional averages?
- Has there been a significant increase or decline in credit hours, enrollments, or degree production of this program?
- Is there a continuing need for the program based on student demand?
- *At the baccalaureate level, is student demand for general education courses met in order to ensure timely degree completion?*

Occupational Demand

- What are the occupational objectives of students enrolled in the program?
- Do state employment projections in occupations related to the program show adequate job openings for graduates?
- Is there a continuing need for the program based on occupational demand? *Have appropriate adjustments in capacity been made?*

Centrality to Instructional Mission

- Is the program central to the instructional mission of the university?
- To what extent does the program provide instructional support to students and faculty in other programs *and for general education*?

Breadth

- Is there sufficient student interest and demand for all courses, specializations, options, and minors offered as part of the program? Are faculty and resources allocated productively?

Costs

- Has there been a significant increase or decrease in the unit costs of the program?
- Do the costs of the program deviate significantly from statewide average costs in the discipline? Can a deviation be corrected within existing resources?

Quality and Productivity

- *What are the unique strengths of the program? How are these strengths reflected in the curriculum and the activities of students and faculty? What particular contributions does the program make to the achievement of institutional priorities and statewide goals and objectives for higher education.*
- What steps have been taken to improve the quality and productivity of this program? What investment and/or cost savings (annual and five-year projection) resulted from the review of this program?
- *What resources are needed to implement the changes and improvements resulting from program review? How will these resources be provided?*

~~• Is the program achieving its objectives? Are faculty qualified and productive? Is the curriculum consistent with program objectives and up to date? Are academic support resources (including library, laboratory, and equipment/materials adequate and up to date? Are high standards for student performance maintained? Do students achieve their academic and career objectives?~~

Responses to identified statewide issues may be incorporated into the summary of each program reviewed or may be submitted as a separate section

**5. Reporting Requirements for Reviews of Public Service and Research Units**

Summaries of the results of the reviews of research and public service units should be submitted on July 1st of each year according to the following guidelines:

A brief summary (one or two pages) should be submitted for each unit reviewed. These summaries should focus on the conclusions of reviews and on the actions taken to improve the quality and productivity of the unit. Reviews of public service and research units should address the following questions, and the key findings and recommendations in each of these areas should be the substance of the summary submitted to the Board of Higher Education.

*Demand:* Is the demand for the research/public services provided by the unit in balance with the unit's capacity to carry out research/public service? Is there a need for the unit based on external demand and support?

*Quality:* Is the unit achieving its objectives? Are faculty and staff making significant contributions to the development and/or application of knowledge or to the delivery of services?

*Centrality:* Is the unit central to the mission of the university? Does the research/public service provided by the unit contribute to instruction of or service to students? Does the research/public service provided by the unit contribute to institutional, regional, or statewide priorities?

*Productivity:* What steps have been taken to improve the productivity of this unit? Are similar research or public service activities conducted by other units? Are there opportunities for improving collaboration among units or consolidating units? What investment and/or cost savings (annual and five-year projection) resulted from the review of this program?

• Proposed new language is in italics.

## APPENDIX B

## PROPOSED RAMP GUIDELINES FOR NEW PROGRAM REQUESTS*

The Illinois Board of Higher Education has the statutory responsibility to approve all new units of instruction, research, and public service, including the establishment of a college, school, department, division, center, or institute. All programs and units must first have received approval by the institution's governing board.

The Priorities Statement (see Section A above) should provide a brief program development plan for new programs and units. Based upon Focus Statements, campuses should identify short-term program goals including new programs to be initiated during the planning year. These program plans will be the object of investment of new resources, as well as of reinvestment of existing resources made available through productivity improvements. The program development plan should focus on initiatives that are fiscally feasible and for which the source of required resources has been identified.

New Program Requests will be accepted by the Illinois Board of Higher Education at any time, although universities are encouraged to submit new program requests, particularly those accompanied by a request for new resources, as part of their RAMP programmatic submission on July 1st.

If a New Program Request is being submitted for a second time, a full proposal is not required. If the resource requirements for the new program have changed, a revised Table IV-3 should be submitted, along with an explanation of why changes were made. If other components of the program have been changed, appropriate narrative updates should be provided.

The format for submitting new program requests is provided in the next section of this Chapter. Requests for approval of new off-campus programs should be submitted in the format provided in *Policies and Procedures for the Approval of Off-Campus Units of Instruction and Application Material for Operating and/or Degree Granting Authority for Off-Campus Units of Instruction (May 1992).*

**New Program Request***

1. Name of Institution:_____
2. Title of Proposed Program: _____
   Level of Proposed Degree Program: Associate _____ Baccalaureate _____ Master's _____
   Certificate of Advanced Study _____ Specialist _____ Doctorate _____ Professional __
3. Six-digit CIP Code:_____
4. Proposed date for initiation of program_____
5. Date of submission of request_____

Mission and Priorities*

6. List the objectives of the proposed program and each specialization or option. Explain how the proposed program relates to the priorities in the university's Priorities Statement.
7. Describe any effects that the proposed program will have on other programs within the institution. Will this program replace any existing programs? Will the enrollments projected for the proposed program reduce enrollments in other programs? (If so, identify these programs.) How will the proposed program support, or be supported by, other programs within the university?

Curriculum

8. Provide a full catalog description of the proposed program. To the extent necessary, the catalog description should be supplemented by additional information needed to respond to questions 9 through 20.
9. Describe the key components of the program (i.e., the core courses required of all students; courses required in areas of specialization; the amount of elective coursework; clinical, practicum, or field work requirements; and thesis or dissertation requirements). Provide the total credit hour requirements for program completion, as well as the credit hour requirement for each component of the curriculum.
10. Without undertaking a course-by-course analysis, explain how the curriculum achieves the objectives of the program by describing the relationship between the overall curriculum or the major curricular components and the objectives defined in 6 above.
11. *Describe how the coursework and program requirements are interconnected, support one another, and result in culminating experiences or products.*
12. *Describe how the curriculum and program requirements will prepare students to assume future career roles. Describe how the program will ensure that externships and other workforce experiences will be available and of high quality.*
13. *Describe how the program will develop academic capabilities such as writing, problem-solving, statistical analysis, and use of technology in a way appropriate to the field, level, and objectives.*

---

*Certain parts of this request (e.g., curriculum, student information, and accreditation and licensure) apply only to instructional programs and should be omitted from requests for research or public service centers or institutes and for new organizational units. In general, items 8-20, 22-27, 29-30, 33, and 40-42 would be omitted from requests for research or public service centers or institutes.

14. Describe admission or prerequisite requirements, such as grade point average, test scores, specific coursework, and majors or degrees required for admission.
15. *Describe how the program will seek to admit students from diverse backgrounds and varied educational and work experiences.*
16. *Describe how the program will ensure "goodness of fit" between the educational goals of students who will be admitted to the program and program objectives.*
17. Describe the amount of proficiency examination, transfer, and prior learning experience credit accepted.
18. Describe other degree completion requirements, such as grade point average required for retention or advancement and graduation and any time limits for completion.
19. Provide course descriptions for each new course identified as part of the curriculum and catalog references to descriptions of current courses included in the curriculum.
20. If the program is designed to serve primarily a part-time clientele, provide an example of the course sequencing in the curriculum over the time pattern that will be used in program delivery. *If the clientele is mixed between part-time and full-time students, describe any measures taken to ensure that students will be afforded comparable opportunities and subject to the same expectations.*

Academic Policies

21. What unit(s) is responsible for the program in such matters as curricular modifications, faculty assignments, and student evaluation. Describe and justify any exceptions to college or university academic policies, admission standards, or graduation requirements that would be made for the proposed program.

Student Information

22. Complete Table IV-1, providing projections of the size of the proposed program. Separate tables should be provided for each option or specialization within the proposed program.
23. Analyze how the proposed program also will support student interests, the undergraduate education curriculum of the university, and/or majors in other degree programs offered by the university. This analysis would be aided by estimating the percentages of the credit hours shown on lines 3 and 4 of Table IV-1 that will be taken by program majors versus non-majors.
24. *Describe how the program will ensure that students understand the purposes of the program. Describe how the program will effectively communicate to students program objectives and will encourage students to invest time and energy in their own and other's learning through active participation and formal and informal learning activities.*
25. *Describe how the program will measure student learning and academic performance as students move through the program and how these results will be communicated to students.*
26. *Describe how the program, consistent with its objectives, will familiarize students with the norms and practices of the discipline.*
27. Describe the characteristics of students to be served by the proposed program, such as resident/commuter, full-/part-time, socioeconomic status, age, racial/ethnic group, and gender. If the program is designed primarily for working adults, describe the types of employment positions held by prospective students.

Statewide Needs and Priorities

28. Identify programs offered by other Illinois colleges and universities that are similar to the proposed program. Analyze the similarities and differences between these programs and the

proposed program in the context of unmet student interests and demand. *What unique strengths will the proposed program provide or develop? What unique contributions will the program make to the achievement of statewide goals and objectives for higher education?*

29. Provide documentation of the student demand for the proposed program, including enrollment trends for the community, region, state, or nation that are relevant to the proposed program.
30. Provide evidence of occupational demand for graduates of the program. If the program is designed to meet the needs of a specific job market, documentation, including historical and projected labor market trends, should be presented on employment demand in relevant sectors of the economy. If the program is designed to address occupational demand in a specific geographic region, documentation, including historical and projected labor market trends, should be presented on employment demand in that geographic region.

Faculty and Staff

31. Describe the qualifications of principal faculty in support of the objectives and curriculum of the proposed program. Without providing individual vita, summarize faculty qualifications such as educational background, non-collegiate experience, and research and service interests and contributions that relate to the program. Indicate how many faculty members are full-time and how many are part-time. Complete Table IV-2, showing the staff requirements in staff years (using the RAMP definition for staff year) for the first five years of operation. Staff requirements shown in Table IV-2 should include positions provided from all sources of funds.
32. Describe the qualifications of new faculty members to be sought to support the program.
33. *Describe how the program will ensure that effective instructional techniques and strategies will be used to promote faculty/student and student/student contact, active student participation, and enhanced student learning.*
34. *Describe the diversity and quality of faculty scholarship, and how faculty scholarship will support program objectives, including multiple objectives such as research and pedagogy.*
35. *Describe the measures that will be used to evaluate faculty instruction, scholarship, and public service efforts. Describe how the program will use student and faculty peer evaluations to enhance instructional effectiveness.*

Support Services

36. Describe the adequacy of current computer and/or laboratory equipment and instructional materials to support the proposed program. Identify generically any new equipment or instructional materials that must be acquired initially, and reflect these expenditures in line 8 of Table IV-3.
37. Describe the adequacy of current library holdings to support the proposed program. Identify generically any new library acquisitions beyond those made annually to maintain the currency of library holdings that are necessary to support the program, and reflect these expenditures on line 9 of Table IV-3.
38. Describe the relevant characteristics of any internship, practicum, or clinical sites that are needed to support the program. Provide evidence of availability of needed sites, and reflect any expenditures on line 10 of Table IV-3.
39. *Describe any program goals or plan that has been developed for using computer and educational technology to meet instructional needs. Describe any computer training and support staff available to faculty to assist them with technology use.*

Accreditation and Licensure

40. What agencies accredit programs and/or license graduates of programs in this field?

41. Will accreditation be sought for the proposed program within the first five years? If so, Table IV-3 should reflect the resources necessary to achieve accreditation. Please document that these resources are sufficient to achieve accreditation according to the standards in the field.

42. If the proposed program will be administered by an academic unit that also is responsible for existing programs, has accreditation been sought for these existing programs? If so, what were the historic results of these accreditation reviews? If the proposed program will be administered by an academic unit that also is responsible for existing programs that lead to licensure, what were the historic trends in success rates for licensure of graduates from these programs?

Financing

43. Complete Table IV-3 showing projections of program expenditures and revenues. Table IV-3 should be completed regardless of whether new state funding is requested in the budget year and should reflect all sources of funds (state and non-state). A narrative budget statement should be provided to explain Table IV-3, as follows:

    a) Projected increments in total resource requirements (line 1) should be explained in terms of projected staff requirements (see Table IV-2), equipment and instructional materials (see item 25), library requirements (see item 26), and contractual services for internship, practicum, or clinical placements (see item 27).

    b) New state resources required (line 6) in the budget year should be explained in terms of assumptions and factors used to construct line items 7 through 11. If resource requirements in the budget year include non-recurring costs (e.g., one-time equipment purchases, accreditation fees, or other start-up costs), describe how these resources will be reallocated in subsequent years.

    c) Describe the nature and source of support from federal sources (line 2) and other non-state sources (line 3).

Table IV-1

STUDENT DEMAND PROJECTIONS FOR THE NEW PROGRAM

| | Budget Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | 4th Year | 5th Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Program Majors (Fall Headcount) | | | | | |
| Annual Full-Time-Equivalent Majors | | | | | |
| Annual Credit Hours in EXISTING Courses [1] | | | | | |
| Annual Credit Hours in NEW Courses [1] | | | | | |
| Annual Number of Degrees Awarded | | | | | |

[1] Include credit hours generated by both majors and non-majors in courses offered by the academic unit directly responsible for the proposed program.

Table IV-2

STAFF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NEW PROGRAM
(in staff years)

| | Budget Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | 4th Year | 5th Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Faculty | | | | | |
| Administrative/Other Professional | | | | | |
| Graduate Assistants | | | | | |
| Civil Service Staff and Student Employees | | | | | |
| Total Staff | | | | | |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table IV-3

**TOTAL RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NEW PROGRAM**

| | | Budget Year | 2nd Year | 3rd Year | 4th Year | 5th Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Total Resource Requirements | | | | | |
| 2 | Resources Available from Federal Sources [1] | | | | | |
| 3 | Resources Available from Other Non-State Sources [1] | | | | | |
| 4 | Existing State Resources [2] | | | | | |
| 5 | State Resources Available through Internal Reallocation [3] | | | | | |
| 6 | New State Resources Required (Line 1 minus the sum of lines 2 through 5) [4] | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Breakdown of New State Resources Required for Budget Year: | | | | | |
| 7 | Staff | | – | – | – | – |
| 8 | Equipment and Instructional Materials | | – | – | – | – |
| 9 | Library | | – | – | – | – |
| 10 | Contractual Services | | – | – | – | – |
| 11 | Other Support Services [5] | | – | – | – | – |

[1] Numbers can be positive or zero only. These lines reflect available funds, not incremental dollars.

[2] The amount of existing state resources in a given year is equal to the sum of the previous year's existing state resources (line 4 plus resources available through internal reallocation (line 5) plus any new state resources required (line 6). Existing state resources allocated to the program in a given year (line 4) may exceed total requirements needed to support the program in the following year. In this event, existing state resources should be reduced by showing a negative dollar amount on line 5 so that the sum of lines 2 through 6 equals line 1.

[3] Numbers can be either positive (allocated to the program) or negative (allocated away from the program).

[4] This number is the level of funding requested in the referenced year. Dollars reported will be incremental.

[5] Other dollars directly assigned to the program. Do not include allocated support services.

* Proposed new language is in italics.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE